DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 418 970 SP 037 936

AUTHOR Thayer-Bacon, Barbara J.; Arnold, Stephanie; Stoots, Jason
TITLE Identification of Caring Professors in Teacher Education Programs.
PUB DATE 1998-04-00
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; College Students; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Student Attitudes; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Educators; Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Bowling Green State University OH; *Caring

ABSTRACT

This study involved developing a method for identifying caring teachers/professors in pre-service teacher education who can then be further studied as part of research on caring. For three semesters, the study gathered nominations from students in their last semester at Bowling Green State University, Ohio. A total of 417 students responded (42 percent response rate) to requests to make nominations of caring professors from the pool of teacher education professors. The study also requested nominations of caring professors by the faculty in the College of Education and Human Development and by faculty connected to the teacher education program. A total of nine percent of the faculty responded. All faculty in the four largest departments involved in teacher education were asked to submit one academic year's scores for selected questions from the standard teacher evaluation forms completed by students at the end of each semester for individual course instruction. Results indicated that teachers who were nominated as caring by their students had high teacher evaluation scores. Students identified 32 percent of the total faculty of the College of Education and Human Development as caring. Some of the results indicated that there was a high rate of nomination in the music education and art education departments, and that students were much more responsive to the request for nominations than were faculty. (Contains 34 references.) (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Identification of Caring Professors in Teacher Education Programs

by
Barbara J. Thayer-Bacon, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Philosophy of Education
Bowling Green State University
with research contributions by
Stephanie Arnold and Jason Stoots
Graduate Students
Guidance & Counseling
Bowling Green State University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
B. Thayer-Bacon
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

American Educational Research Association
SIG: Wholistic Education
Roundtable Session

ED 418 970

Introduction

Many famous scholars have argued from different perspectives for the value of understanding students as whole persons, not just minds we are trying to educate (Dewey 1938/1965, 1916/1944; Rogers 1980, 1983; Brown 1971, 1975; Montessori 1948/1973, 1967/1972, 1966/1977; Neill 1960; Illich 1973). When scholars speak of students as whole persons they remind us students have bodies and hearts and souls, which all must be cared for as much as their minds. They also urge us to try to understand that these separate, distinct parts, as Euro-western scholars tend to describe "them", are really integrated aspects of one whole living being, who is also an integrated part of the greater universe. More recently, several feminist scholars have argued for the need to include caring in teaching students, reminding us again that a more holistic approach to education must include recognizing students as emotionally feeling people who live in relation with others (Martin 1992, 1994; Noddings 1986, 1992).

When we try to research affective qualities (and spiritual qualities) of education, we run into a fog which is hard to "pin down" and quantify by Euro-western standards of good research. By qualitative standards, we find we are in new territory, and must

SP037936

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

try to find our own way through the fog. My efforts, and others, to better understand caring's role in education are being conducted from several different approaches. I continue to analyze *caring* from a philosophical perspective and argue for the value of it at a theoretical level (1996, 1998). In an effort to further define caring in a relational manner, I have interviewed students in my classrooms at my current university (1996, Spring 1996). In a further effort to define caring, Dr. Charles S. Bacon and I (Spring 1996) conducted a pilot study in which we interviewed six professors we had taught with and knew well at a personal level, thus allowing us to verify that *caring* is a central focus in their classrooms and in their own research. However, if the study of affective research is limited to people researchers know personally and are able to therefore verify their affective qualities, it is limited indeed. In an effort to widen the possible research data base, I am currently trying to address this problem: how does one go to an unknown school building, or teacher education program in an unfamiliar College of Education, and identify teachers who are caring, so they may be observed, interviewed, and studied, as well as their students?

My objective is to develop a method for identifying caring teachers/professors who can then be further studied as part of research on *caring*. I have spent this past year testing out different methods of identification, as well as doing an extensive search of the literature for others who are attempting to address similar concerns. Since I have defined caring as a relational quality (see next section), I hypothesized that one would be able to identify caring educators by asking their students for nominations or by comparing teacher evaluation scores and for the questions related to caring, finding the educators who had the highest scores. Of the two methods, I predicted nominations would be easier to obtain, and I hoped they may be as reliable as teacher evaluation scores.

For 3 semesters I gathered nominations from students who are in their last semester at Bowling Green State University (BGSU, total pool of approximately 1,000

students). These students were asked to make nominations of *caring professors* from the pool of teacher education professors they had while attending BGSU. On the nomination form, the descriptors used to help define caring were the ones generated by my college students (see attached form). As a way of contrasting the student nominations to other forms of election, I also requested nominations of caring professors by the faculty in the College of Education and Human Development, as well as those faculty connected to the teacher education program (such as math education and music education) (total pool of 247 full-time, retired, and adjunct faculty). I requested nominations be made by the seven department chairs in the College in order to receive administrative nominations as well.

For stage Two of this study, in an effort to contrast the method of individual nominations, by students, colleagues, or administrators, and adjust for qualitative aspects of individual nominations, I requested all faculty in the 4 largest departments involved in teacher education at BGSU (173 faculty) submit one academic year's scores for selected questions from the standard teacher evaluation forms completed at the end of each semester for individual course instruction. There are four different evaluation forms, for at BGSU each department uses their own forms. Many tenured faculty within the four departments do not use their department's standardized forms, but instead use their own personally designed forms, and thus were unable to participate in Stage Two of this study. The selected teacher evaluation questions were ones identified through a triangulated process as being related to caring (see attached evaluation forms and marked selected questions). The teacher evaluation scores for all requested faculty in the college who were willing and able to submit their selected scores were compiled and then compared and contrasted with nominations of caring faculty.

My goal is to report on my testing methods and make a recommendation as to how teachers/professors who are caring can be easily, safely, and accurately

identified and therefore further studied. I begin by defining *caring* as used for this study, with the help of the theoretical work of philosophers and psychologists studying caring, as well as with the help of the educators originally interviewed in the pilot study, and the undergraduate college students in the teacher education program at Bowling Green State University. I then move on to a careful description of Stage 1 of this study and a discussion of its results. I then describe Stage 2 and discuss its results. I conclude with a general discussion and recommendation for further researchers attempting to study *caring educators*.

My research supports the value of caring in helping students learn (1996). It is based on a relational epistemology model which emphasizes the social, interactive, and affective sides of learning, as well as cognition (Spring 1997). A relational approach to knowledge views students in a holistic manner. Caring teachers/professor have significant impact of their students' lives, including students of different cultural backgrounds, and different genders. I believe that this research will help educators understand how they can help their students be successful learners. This is especially important for professors in teacher education programs to understand, as we are the professors who are modeling good teaching to the next generation of teachers. We teach the teachers who work with the children in our schools. If we are better able to understand how teachers establish *caring relationships* with their students, hopefully more students of all ages in the future will experience more caring educators during their educational careers.

What is caring?

It is important to begin by establishing a clear definition of *caring* as used in my research, for *caring* is a common term used by many to signify very different meanings. As I conducted an extensive literature review for others working to identify caring educators, I found work related to caring, for example, by Vicki Linkous (1989), Morse,

Solberg, Neander, Bottorff, and Johnson (1990), Dwight Rogers and Jaci Webb (1991), Hayes, Ryan, and Zsellar (1994), and Kris Bosworth (1995). I also found instruments that may relate to identifying caring teachers, for example Liddell (1990). However, no instrument for identifying caring teachers has been found, as of yet. I am still looking. I continually ran into the problem of thinking I had found a potential source, so that I would not have to develop a method for identifying caring educators, only to find on closer examination, that the term *caring* was being used as a personal attribute (like describing someone as a humorous, intuitive, or sensitive person) rather than in a relational manner. When caring is treated as a personal attribute, and people who are caring are defined as people who are more focused on feelings than thinking, then it is possible to administer a psychological test such as the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, focusing on the thinking/feeling scale, as Liddell (1990) did in her study in order to identify "caring" people. However, such an approach helps us find people who may be more emotional than rational in their approach to issues, at a personal level, not people who are successful at establishing caring relationships with others.

I expect most teachers would say they are caring, if asked. Many say, that is why they chose a career in education, because they care for students and want to make a difference in their lives. However, if one asks students how many caring teachers they have had during their school careers, we find a different response (many say less than five), which serves to remind us that while we may perceive ourselves as caring, that does not mean that others perceive us that way. We begin to understand that being an emotional or intuitive type person does not necessarily make us more caring.

Younger students define caring in terms of "helping" and "loving" (Bosworth, 1995). Bosworth's (1995) interviewed students define caring teachers as: valuing individuality, showing respect, being tolerant, explaining work, checking for understanding, encouraging, and planning fun activities. Hayes et. al.'s (1994) study

of middle school children revealed caring teachers were defined in terms such as: fun, advice giving, listening, avoiding harshness, and showing interest in student affairs. In my interviews with college students, caring teachers are: willing to listen, have empathy, go a step further, offer encouragement, are flexible, are available, are approachable, get to know you and have time for you, ask for students' input, make you feel important, are concerned, can be trusted, and more (see enclosed nomination form).

In our pilot study (Spring 1996), the professors we interviewed defined caring in terms of: trying to be approachable and welcoming to students, placing their emphasis on the learning process and on learning conceptually, offering students a say in what they are learning so they can experience engaged learning, and being concerned with making their classrooms safe, supportive environments where engaged learning can take place.

How do philosophers and psychologists define caring?[1] Maxine Greene (1990) asserts that caring involves a form of "attachment to those one is serving or working with." It is possible, however, for people to form attachments in ways that are not caring, as with hedonistic, manipulative forms of "caring" I call "mirror caring" (in press). Jane Roland Martin (1992) looks to the home and parenting to help define caring and Sara Ruddick (1989) defines caring in terms of "mothering" in *Maternal Thinking*. However, placing caring in an exclusively domestic domain, even a reconstructed domestic domain, risks others' mistakenly reinscribing a false public/private dichotomy. Thus, caring is allowed to remain hidden from public sight, and caring remains devalued as private and personal. Carol Gilligan (1982) and Belenky et al. (1986) describe caring as being an ethical orientation expressed by girls and women which is relational, based on a concept of self that is rooted in a sense of connection and relatedness to others. Nel Noddings (1986) describes caring in terms of feminine qualities. These ways of defining caring leave us vulnerable to the false

conclusion that only women can care. I encourage us not to make the dangerous and false assumption that caring is feminine, and therefore gender specific. Feminist scholars such as Jean Grimshaw (1986), as well as the above named authors, have warned us *not* to link caring to only girls and women.

Milton Mayeroff (1971) describes caring as "recognizing the intrinsic worth of the 'other' and being committed to promoting its growth for its own sake." Nel Noddings (1986) also describes caring as always being relational, between the carer and the one cared-for. This is an important quality of caring. Caring involves a "feeling with" the other (other people, other life forms, or even inanimate objects), and it stresses attending to the other. All caring involves presence (being present), generosity, and acquaintance. Noddings (1986) does not describe caring in terms of "empathy" for empathy can be taken to mean a projecting of oneself onto others. For her, caring is a move away from the self toward being receptive of the other. This relational quality of caring is very important for it helps us understand that caring is <u>not</u> just an individual personality trait of the one-caring, but is in direct relation to an other who receives the caring, the one cared-for. Defining caring in a relational manner helps us be able to identify and understand forms of not-caring.

"By caring, I do not mean caring for another person, such as liking or loving someone, though certainly if one has an affection or fondness for someone else he or she also cares about that special someone. People do not have to like or love each other in order to care. People do need to develop the ability to be receptive and open to other people and their ideas, willing to attend to them, to listen and consider their possibilities. Care does NOT entail that people agree with each other. Care does mean people are open to possibly hearing others' voices more completely and fairly. Caring about other people (and in agreement with Noddings and Mayeroff, other people's ideas, other life forms, or even inanimate objects) requires respecting others as separate, autonomous people (ideas, other life forms, etc.) worthy of caring. It is an

attitude, that gives value to others, by denoting that others are worth attending to in a serious or close manner. An attitude of acceptance and trust, inclusion and openness, is important in all caring relationships" (author, Summer 1993, 325). Now that we have clearly defined *caring* and highlighted its relational quality, let us move on to the problem of trying to identify caring people with whom we have not established caring relationships ourselves, and for whom we do not know.

Stage 1

Bowling Green State University was chosen as a site to test out identification methods for *caring professors* because of the large size of the teacher education program and accessability. For the first stage of methodology testing, a survey was developed based on students definitions of *caring* (BGSU students surveyed in 1994-1996, in EDFI 408 class, "American Education in a Pluralistic Society") (See attached sheet in appendix). The survey was delivered through the mail to the faculty and administration, and it was personally distributed to students in their final Sprint courses (6 week classes offered during their student teaching semester), as well as at their Orientation meeting for student teaching. Completed surveys were returned in a manilla envelope, through the mail, and by dropping off surveys into a marked box in the Field Placement Office. All completed surveys were anonymous, and retained in a locked file to insure confidentiality. The names of faculty have been removed, and coded to insure confidentiality as well. Nominated faculty have been grouped by department, and categorized as to whether they were nominated by a student, faculty member, or administration. The number of nominations received are recorded as well. What follows is Table 1, representing the number of nominations received by faculty, students, and administrators.

Table 1. Numbers of nominations received by faculty, students, and administrators

Nominees	Nominations Faculty	Students	Admin.
EDFI			
A		1	
B		3	
C		1	
D		10	
E		2	
F		15	
G		3	
H		3	
I		2	
J		14	
K		2	
L		6	
M		2	
EDAS			
A		6	
B		2	
C		11	
D		4	
E		1	
F		1	
G		3	
H		1	
Art Educ.			
A		1	
B		2	
C		2	
D		4	

Nominees	Nominations Faculty	Students	Admin.
EDCI			
A		1	
B	2	33	
C		1	
D		9	
E		3	
F		2	
G	4	6	
H		1	
I	1	10	
J		15	
K		1	
L		12	
M		3	
N		14	
O		3	
P		4	
Q		3	
R		22	
S		23	
T	1	1	
U		4	
V	3	34	
W		5	
X		1	
Y		5	
Music Educ.			
A		1	
B		2	
C		1	
D		4	
E		3	

Nominees	Nominations Faculty	Students	Admin.
EDSE			
A	1	1	
B		6	
C		3	
D		1	
E		0	1
F		3	
G		1	
H		2	
I	1	1	
J		1	
K	1	0	
L		1	
M		6	
N		1	
O	1	0	
HPER			
A		3	
B		2	
C	1	0	
D		1	
E	1	0	
F		0	
G	1	17	
H		1	
HED			
I	1	23	
J	1	4	
K		1	
KNS			
L		2	
M		1	
N		3	
O	1	3	

We[2] received only 1 administrative nomination from the 7 people asked (14% return rate), and that person was not nominated by any students . We received 23 nominations from faculty (out of 247 faculty asked, 9% return rate) and 4 of those nominations were not nominated by any students. We received 417 nominatons from students, out of approximately 1,000 surveyed (42% return rate). Obtaining nominations was not an easy task. For each pool of nominees asked, we had to develop follow-up methods in order to insure nominations were received. Faculty and administrators were sent second requests. Students who had been asked while attending their student orientation meeting were asked a second time in their smaller sprint classrooms, with the researcher remaining in the room to collect surveys at time of asking, for less than 10 surveys were returned from over 400 students when they were not collected on site. A second student orientation meeting with on-site collection resulted in a much higher return rate.

Some faculty received as many as 34, 33, 23, and 22 nominations (2 received more that 30 nominations, 3 received more than 20 nominations but less than 30), while many others received less than 5 nominations (57 received less than 5 nominations). The number of faculty who received between 5 and 20 nominations are 17. This means that a total of 79 faculty were nominated by BGSU students as caring professors, out of a possible 247 faculty (full-time, part-time, and retired), or 32% of the faculty who teach in the College of Education and Human Development at BGSU. By departments, 25 out of 56 (45% of dept.) faculty nominations were from EDCI (the methods courses), 13 out of 31 (42% of dept.) were from EDFI (the core foundations courses), 12 out of 31 (39% of dept.) were from EDSE (special education courses), 12 out of 55 (22% of dept.) were from HPER.(health education courses), 7 out of 20 (35% of dept.) were from EDAS (one foundations course), 4 out of 8 (50% of dept.) were from Art Education and 5 out of 10 (50% of dept.) were from Music Education.

We do not believe any statement can be made concerning a correlation between number of nominations received and an assumed quality of teaching, by individual faculty members, or by departments. Who was nominated and how many times was directly affected by who chose to fill out the survey forms and who was asked. While we asked all the faculty and administrators in the college, only a select number returned their surveys to us. While we asked all the students who were seniors and had completed their teacher education courses (for 1996-1997), students could only nominate from the pool of teachers they personally had, and many of them chose not to fill out a nomination form. We did not assume that because some faculty member A had received more than 20 nominations, and another faculty member B had received only one, that this meant the one was more caring than the other. We only concluded that more students for teacher A (over 20 nominations) filled out the form. It could be: 1) that teacher A taught more undergraduate teacher education courses and fewer graduate courses, thus having more students available for nominations; 2) that teacher B was on leave for part of the time students were taking courses and therefore available less number of semesters for teaching; 3) that teacher B also taught a large lecture class of @200 students and thus was in a setting where it is much more difficult to establish caring relationships; or 4) that teacher B taught a particular subject that made caring more difficult to develop as a teacher/student quality, for example a difficult mathematics-oriented class; 5) it could be that teacher A was the most recent teacher the students had and thus was easy to recall; 6) whereas teacher B taught the students asked for nominations 2 or 3 years ago and was not so easily recalled. These are all research questions to pursue in the future.

We do think it is fair to conclude that BGSU has a high number of professors in teacher education who are perceived as caring by their students. The actual percentage is even higher than it looks, for many of the 247 faculty do not teach undergraduate teacher education courses and were not a part of our potential pool of

teachers available for nominations. For example, EDFI has 31 total faculty but 10 do not teach undergraduate teacher education courses, so if we consider only undergraduate teachers the percentage of teacher education faculty in EDFI nominated as caring is really 62% rather than 42%. We also think it is accurate to conclude that researchers will receive more nominations if students are asked, instead of colleagues or administrators. Thirdly, in the higher education level, it is safe to say the departments of EDCI, EDFI, EDSE, HPER are a good place to look for large numbers of caring professors. These are the departments we chose to target for Stage 2 of this study as we sought another way to identify caring teachers that can help adjust for nominations. We note the high rate of nominations for music education and art education (50%), suggesting that if a researcher was looking for caring professors and did not need a large number of candidates, music education and art education may be the best places to look, or at least offer settings where caring is more likely established between teachers and students.

Stage 2

For stage two, student evaluation forms were examined from a selected number of departments, the four departments that are directly teaching teacher education courses and received the greatest number of nominations (EDCI, curriculum and instruction; EDFI, foundations and inquiry; EDSE, special education; HPER, health, physical education, and recreation). Standard student evaluation forms used by each department were collected and examined. It was discovered that each department uses a different type of form. Selected faculty were surveyed to determine which questions on these standard teacher evaluation forms related to the quality of *caring*, using the nomination form definition of caring as a guide. It was determined that EDFI's form included 12 out of 22 questions (55%), HPER's form included 6 out of 14 questions (43%), EDCI's form included 4 out of 15 questions (27%), and EDSE's form included 7 out of 32 questions (22%). As each department had a different evaluation

form with a different number of questions identified as addressing caring-related qualities, the reported scores varied in terms of number of scores as well as the overall rating scale used for scoring. Because they all use different forms, comparisons between departments are difficult to make.

Once the questions related to caring were singled out, then the evaluation scores for these specific questions were requested of all faculty members of these 4 departments, full-time, retired, and adjunct, a total of 173 professors (see attached forms in appendix). Faculty voluntarily submitted their teacher evaluation scores for the courses they had taught in their most recent year of teaching (so that recently retired faculty could participate in this stage of the study as well). We made three letter requests for scores, and then made personal requests in order to obtain as many scores as possible for our study. The number of courses which were used as data for submitted scores varied with faculty as their course loads varied for their most recent year of teaching. Therefore, in order to address the varieties in amount of scores reported, we determined to obtain the mean score for the caring related questions, and report scores with appropriate scales. The scores for faculty who were nominated, and by whom (administrators, faculty, or students), are distinguished on Table 2 from the scores submitted by faculty who were not nominated as caring.

It was discovered that for some departments (EDSE and EDCI) faculty within the department do not necessarily use the department's standard form. Therefore, the selection of faculty to participate in Stage 2 was narrowed to those faculty in EDFI, EDSE, EDCI, and HPER who use the standard department student evaluation forms for their course evaluations. Selection of faculty participating in Stage 2 became further narrowed by the elimination of: those choosing not to participate in the study, those who only taught graduate courses, and those who had not retained their evaluation scores. The number of faculty participating in Stage 2 is 19, 2 from EDFI, 4 from EDCI, 2 from EDSE, and 11 from HPER (11% return rate, a low return rate).

Table 2

Mean scores on "caring" items as suplied by student evaluations

EDFI 5-pt. scale	# Classes Taught	Nominated	Not Nominated	# Nominations F	# Nominations S	Mean Scores Caring	Mean Scores t-mean
A	5	X			1	3.818	
B	5	X			6	4.311	

EDCI 4-pt. scale	# Classes Taught	Nominated	Not Nominated	# Nominations F	# Nominations S	Mean Scores Caring	Mean Scores t-mean
A	2	X			4	3.368	
B	1		X				3.825
C	3	X			1	3.744	
D	2	X			5	3.175	

EDSE 7-pt. scale	# Classes Taught	Nominated	Not Nominated	# Nominations F	# Nominations S	Mean Scores Caring	Mean Scores t-mean
A	2		X				4.56
B	1	X		1		2.317	

HPER 5-pt. scale	# Classes Taught	Nominated	Not Nominated	# Nominations F	# Nominations S	Mean Scores Caring	Mean Scores t-mean
A	5	X			3	4.521	
B	3		X				4.418
C	1		X				3.155
D	3		X				3.777
E	4	X			2	4.296	
F	4		X				4.319
G	6	X		2		4.485	
H	5	X			1	4.274	
I	2		X				4.621
J	4		X				4.348
K	2	X		1	16	4.535	

For the two faculty members in EDFI, both people received higher mean scores (>3.50 on a 5 pt. scale) and both were also nominated by students as caring. One person's mean score is clearly higher than the other's, and it turns out that the one with the higher score is also the one who received more nominations. In EDCI, with four faculty scores, all four scores are in a high range (>3.0), with two being very high (>3.50 on a 4 pt. scale). Three of the faculty were nominated by students as caring, however the person with the highest score is the only faculty member who was not

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

nominated and the person with the lowest score is the one who received the most student nominations. For EDSE we obtained only 2 faculty evaluation scores, and both faculty mean scores were not very high (<5 on a 7 pt. scale). Neither one was nominated by students as caring, however the one faculty member with the lowest evaluation score is someone who was nominated by a faculty member as caring.

The department of HPER offered us the greatest number of returns, 11 faculty turned in their evaluation scores to be examined. Only one score was lower (<3.5 on a 5 pt. scale), while 10 are in the high range (>3.5) and 3 are very high (>4.5). Both faculty members whose scores were <4.0 did not receive student nominations, however the person with the highest evaluation scores related to caring also did not receive any student nominations, while the person with the second highest score received a large number of nominations (17). Of the 3 faculty members with very high evaluation scores, 2 received nominations. Of those in the high range, but not the very high (3.5-4.5) 3 received nominatons from students. The total average of scores in HPER, for faculty who were nominated (5) is 4.422, and for faculty who were not nominated (6) the total average is 4.106. Clearly, in HPER the nominated faculty have higher scores, however the nonnominated faculty scores are still in the high range. Overall, nominated faculty scores are higher, although on an individual basis this is not true, some nonnominated faculty received higher teacher evaluation scores then their nominated colleagues.

We conclude that we have achieved mixed results when we attempt to compare nominatons to evaluation scores. That some faculty with very high evaluation scores were not nominated as caring highlights the fact that who is nominated will depend on many factors, as described in our Stage 1 discussion. It is interesting to note that while we had faculty with high scores who were missed for nominations, we did not have faculty who were nominated by students who had low teacher evaluation scores. We did, however, have one faculty member (with the lowest score of the 19 faculty

participating) receive a faculty nomination. This result suggests that faculty nominations are less likely to be accurate, and this would be a question worth pursuing in further research. The one person who was nominated by an administrator is not someone who teaches in teacher education classes and thus was not included in Stage 2.

It is important to consider the quality of evaluation forms used by the 4 departments for Stage 2. There is a significant difference in the number of questions on the forms that have anything to do with caring, making it reasonable to conclude that EDFI's form, with a 55% rate (caring related questions, out of total questions), and HPER's form, with a 43% rate, are better instruments for measuring caring than EDCI's form (27% rate) and EDSE's form (22% rate). In fact, many faculty with tenure in EDCI and EDSE have designed their own evaluation forms and use those instead for they expressed to us that they find the standard department forms do not give very helpful feedback. Allowing educators to design their own teacher evaluation forms supports academic freedom but makes it very difficult for researchers to identify caring educators using teacher evaluation scores as a method. Developing an easily administered survey would be helpful.

It would be interesting to explore the caring quality of those professors who self-selected out of this study due to their use of individual forms. Given their expressed desire for more feedback from students, we hypothesize that a researcher would find many caring professors among that group, who were not included in Stage 2 but were likely nominated in Stage 1. Before a researcher attempts to identify caring educators using teacher evaluation forms as a method, we highly recommend that the evaluation forms be carefully examined as instruments for measuring caring, and those with low rates (<40%) not be considered accurate instruments. It is interesting to note that half of the teacher evaluation forms currently in use at BGSU in these 4 departments ask a low rate of questions that address caring as a quality of good teaching. Also, the two

forms with the low rate of questions on caring are in the two departments most directly tied to teacher education programs with the most faculty teaching the most courses to future teachers, Special Education and Curriculum & Instruction. If caring related qualities are not valued by departments and schools by not being included in their teacher evaluation forms, then teachers who are caring will not be able to be identified through a teacher evaluation method.

Several faculty members with high teacher evaluation scores on questions which address caring, wrote notes on their evaluation forms pointing out that for classes where their scores were lower, there was less opportunity for teacher interaction with students because of the unique structure of a particular course. This is another line of research questions to pursue. Does the number of students in a teacher's classroom effect their evaluation scores? Does the number of times per week, or minutes per session that the class meets effect their evaluation scores? Does the type of subject taught effect their ability to be perceived by students as caring? What about gender issues; do females receive higher evaluation scores because in our genderized society females are perceived to be more caring, or are they judged more harshly because it is assumed they will be caring? Ethnicity and race questions arise as well: do White students judge Black teachers more harshly, or vice versa, or does caring transcend racist tendencies? How is caring expressed by teachers and perceived by students from different cultures? These are all research questions worth further investigation.

Finally, we want to address the quality of ease, for identifying caring educators. We did not find either method easy, but by far and away, the easiest method for identification is by seeking student nominations. If a researcher has the opportunity to ask for nominations with a large group of students in one setting (as we did our second and third semesters of seeking nominations), and the researcher collects the nominations at the time of request (as we did the third semester), the greatest number

of nominations will be achieved. Seeking to identify caring educators through the use of teacher evaluation forms is much more time consuming with a much lower result rate (11% return rate as compared to 42% through nominations). One cannot even make the case that teacher evaluation forms is a more accurate way of identifying caring educators, for the quality of the forms will greatly affect this result. Given that we found many faculty with high evaluation scores who were not nominated as caring by students we asked, we want to reassert that student nominations will not uncover all caring teachers in a building or program. However, given that we found no nominated faculty who had low teacher evaluation scores, we do think it is safe to assume researchers will find educators who are perceived by their students to be caring through a nominations process. It would be necessary to actually interview the nominated teachers and their students, and observe the teachers in their classrooms, to verify the accuracy of student nominations. This is a future project for researchers interested in studying *caring*.

Conclusion

Once different means for identification are tested, and a means of identifying caring teachers/professors is established, then people will be able to observe and interview a wide range of nominated teachers and their students. Being able to identify unknown caring teachers by a method such as student nominations will allow researchers to approach any site and feel reasonably comfortable they will know how to find people in that site whom they could potentially study. This will greatly enhance the opportunities to study *caring* in our schools and college programs involving a much larger range and variety of perspectives, thus opening up *caring research* to multiple perspectives.

This research project seeks to contribute toward the establishing of methods for identifying caring educators. We realize the difficulty of attempting to quantify such an affective quality as *caring*, however, given the value of treating students as whole

persons and that teachers who attempt to establish caring relationships with their students are treating students in a more holistic manner, we think it is worth the effort to attempt to identify and study these caring educators. Studying caring educators places significance on their efforts, and allows research in education to acknowledge the importance of viewing students and teachers in a more holistic manner.

NOTES

1. This discussion defining caring was originally developed in "The Power of Caring" and further refined for "How Can Caring Help?: A Personalized Cross-Generational Examination of Violent Adolescent Experiences in Schools," both of which are in press.
2. I use "we" to discuss the results for my graduate assistants, Jason Stoots and Stephanie Arnold, were actively involved in the data collection and analysis of these findings. We have worked on this part of the study together.

REFERENCES:

Belenky, Mary Field, Clinchy, Blythe McVicker, Goldberger, Nancy Rule and Tarule, Jill Mattuck. 1986. *Women's ways of knowing.* USA: Basic Books, Harper Collins Publisher.

Bosworth, Kris. May 1995. Caring for others and being cared for: Students talk caring in school, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(9): 686-93.

Bottorff, Joan L., Morse, Janice M., Neander, Wendy L., and Solberg, Shirley M. September 1990. Concepts of caring and caring as a concept, *Advances in Nursing Science, 13*(1): 1-14.

Brown, George I. 1971. *Human teaching for human learning.* New York, NY: Viking Press.

Brown, George I. 1975. *The live classroom.* New York, NY: Viking Press.

Dewey, John. 1938/1965. *Experience and education.* NY: The Macmillan Co.

Dewey, John. 1916/1944. *Democracy and education.* NY: The Macmillan Co.

Gilligan, Carol. 1982. *In a different voice* . Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Greene, Maxine. 1990. The tensions and passions of caring, in M. Leininger and J. Watson, eds., *The caring imperative in education* . New York: National League for Nursing, 29-44.

Grimshaw, Jean. 1986. *Philosophy and feminist thinking.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Hayes, Charles, Ryan, Alice, and Zsellar, Elaine. Nov 1994. The middle school child's perceptions of caring teachers, *American Journal of Education*, 103(1): 1-19.

Illich, Ivan. 1973. *Deschooling Society.* New York: Harper & Row.

Liddell, Debora L. 1990. *Measure of moral orientation: Construction of an objective instrument measuirng care and justice with an integration of gender differences.* Auburn, AL: Auburn University, Dissertation UMI # AAI9109093.

Linkous, Vicki. 1989. *Patterns of caring: A study of the perceptions of teachers and students.* Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Dissertation: DA 8922358.

Martin, Jane Roland. 1985. *Reclaiming a conversation.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Martin, Jane Roland. 1992. *The schoolhome.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Martin, Jane Roland. 1994. The ideal of the educated person, in *Changing the Educational Landscape.* New York and London: Routledge.

Mayeroff, Milton. 1971. *On caring.* New York: Harper and Row.

Montessori, Maria. 1967, 1972. *The discovery of the child*, translated by M. Josephy Costelloe, S. J. New York: Ballantine Books.

Montessori, Maria. 1948, 1973. *To educate the human potential.* Thiruvanmiyur, India: Kalakshetra Publications.

Montessori, Maria. 1966, 1977. *The secret of childhood*, translated by M. Josephy Costelloe, S. J. New York: Ballantine Books.

Neill, A. S. 1960. *Summerhill: A radical approach to child rearing.* New York City: Hart Publishing Co.

Noddings, Nel. 1986. *Caring* . Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Noddings, Nel. 1992. *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education.* New York and London: Teachers College Press.

Rogers, Carl R. 1983. *Freedom to learn for the 80's.* Columbus, OH: C. E. Merrill Pub. Co.

Rogers, Carl R. 1980. *A way of being.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Rogers, Dwight and Webb, Jaci. May-June 1991. The ethic of caring in teacher education, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(3): 173-81.

Ruddick, Sara. 1989. *Maternal thinking: Toward a politics of peace.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Thayer-Bacon, Barbara. Summer 1993. Caring and its relationship to critical thinking. *Educational Theory* 43 (3): 323-340.

Thayer-Bacon, Barbara. Spring 1997. The nurturing a relational epistemology. *Educational Theory,* 47(2): 239-260.

Thayer-Bacon, Barbara. In press. The power of caring. *Philosophical Studies in Education.* Atlanta, GA: The Ohio Valley Philosophy of Education Society.

Thayer-Bacon, Barbara. In press. How can caring help?: A personalized cross-generational examination of violent adolescent experiences in schools, in *Peacebuilding for adolescents*, Linda Foley and Ian Harris (eds). New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Thayer-Bacon, Barbara and Bacon, Charles. Spring 1996. Caring in the college/university classroom, *Educational Foundations* 10(2): 53-72.

Thayer-Bacon, Barbara and Bacon, Charles. 1996. Caring professors: A model, *Journal of General Education*, 45(4): 255-269.

Thayer-Bacon, Barbara with contributions by Bacon, Charles. 1998. *Philosophy applied to education: Nurturing a democratic community in the classroom.* Columbus, OH and Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Publishing, Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bowling Green State University

Department of Educational
Foundations & Inquiry
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403-0251
(419) 372-7322
Fax: (419) 372-8265

Dear (Bowling Green State University seniors who are student teaching this semester; BGSU CEAP department chairs; BGSU CEAP faculty),

I am attempting to develop a method for identifying caring teachers or professors who can then be further studied as part of my research on **caring**. This year it is my goal to test out different methods of identification. I am requesting you make nominations from the pool of teacher education professors at BGSU. These nominations will be compared and contrasted with student-teacher evaluation scores (upon given permission by the nominated faculty member). Your participation in this survey/nomination process is strictly voluntary. Completion of the survey/nomination form is consent of your willingness to participate.

This is not meant to be a popularity contest. I am seeking exemplary teachers/professors who are unusually strong in their abilities to care, as defined by BGSU students. Please read the enclosed description of what caring means and nominate any professor(s) in the BGSU teacher education program you feel strongly fits this description. All nominations are strictly confidential. They may be turned in at this time, or upon reflection, into a marked nomination box in the Field Placement Office, Room 365 Education Building.

Thank you for your assistance!

Sincerely,

Barbara Thayer-Bacon

Dr. Barbara J. Thayer-Bacon
Assistant Professor, EDFI
372-2697
Rm 314 Education Building

Caring Teachers/Professors (defined by BGSU EDFI 408 students, 1994-1996)

-are willing to listen
-have empathy (feel with people)
-go a step further (help understanding)
-offer encouragement
-are flexible
-allow for special circumstances that come up in students' lives
-are available
-are approachable
-get to know you (your interests, your personality)
-have a student-driven curriculum, ask for students' input
-have time for you
-make you feel important
-advise you, help you (are concerned)
-keep their promises, can be trusted
-see potential in you (have high expectations for students' learning)
-praise you (acknowledgment)
-give you feedback (constructive criticism)
-discipline their students (find positive sources of attention)
-are committed to students (are aware of problems, follow-up on problems)
-want students to succeed and help them attain success
-are interactive (ask questions)
-are humble (have a willingness to learn)
-instill curiosity
-stay current, are able to relate to students' lives
-give chances to do well
-are prepared for the unexpected
-push/don't push at appropriate times
-are genuinely interested in students outside of the classroom curriculum.

Is there any teacher education professor you have had while a student at Bowling Green State University whom you think fits the above description? Is there a colleague you have who fits this description? If so, please nominate that person, so that further understanding of caring professors may be researched, through observation of them and interviews with them and their students. (Tear off this bottom portion and return to the field placement office, Room 365 Education Building. All nominations are strictly confidential.)

Name(s) _____ Department _____ Course(s) Taught

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EDFI

Student Evaluation of Course Instruction

Student evaluations affect salary increases, promotions, tenure, and faculty improvement. Please take this responsibility seriously and respond honestly to each item. Anonymity will be honored and results will not be shared with the professor until next semester.

Please use a #2 pencil. Write the professor's last name in the boxes marked "Name" and the section number of the course in the first four boxes marked "Special Codes." Do NOT darken in the corresponding circles. Please use the following rating scale to evaluate the professor of this course.

1 = not at all descriptive
2 = seldom descriptive
3 = somewhat descriptive
4 = fairly descriptive
5 = very descriptive

The professor of this course:

1. was knowledgeable about the content and issues of the course.
2. had high expectations of student performance.
3. provided assignments that were helpful in understanding the objectives of the course.
4. used materials and assignments effectively.
5. was fair and consistent in grading.
6. clearly stated the goals and objectives of the course.
7. was well organized and consistently prepared for class and meetings with students.
8. presented concepts clearly.
9. demonstrated effective use of course time.
10. encouraged, when appropriate, students' questions and opinions.
11. clearly defined the responsibilities of the student.
12. treated students with respect.
13. encouraged the class and individuals to accomplish the course objectives.
14. demonstrated respect for a student's gender, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, religion, and physical challenges.
15. was available for help when requested.
16. encouraged students to think critically and/or creatively.
17. demonstrated concern for a student's success.
18. periodically provided clear information related to a student's academic progress.
19. was a model of someone interested in ideas and learning.
20. demonstrated enthusiasm for the course content and the act of teaching.
21. practiced what s/he taught when an appropriate situation presented itself.
22. overall was effective.

How descriptive are the following three statements about your effort in this course?

23. I attended class and was prepared.
24. I was attentive and responsive in class.
25. I devoted an appropriate amount of time to the completion of assignments.

STUDENTS' EVALUATION OF COURSE

EDCI

(Circle One)	Strongly Agree A	Agree B	Disagree C	Strongly Disagree D
1. Overall, the course was good	SA	A	D	SD
2. The instructor seemed to be interested in students as persons	SA	A	D	SD
3. The course material seemed worthwhile	SA	A	D	SD
4. Assignments were helpful in understanding the course	SA	A	D	SD
5. The instructor had a thorough knowledge of his subject matter	SA	A	D	SD
6. The instructor encouraged the development of new viewpoints and appreciations	SA	A	D	SD
7. The course increased my general knowledge	SA	A	D	SD
8. I think that the course was taught quite well	SA	A	D	SD
9. Generally, the course was well organized	SA	A	D	SD
10. Interaction with group (is sensitive to the reactions of the class, encourages student participation, welcomes questions and discussions)	SA	A	D	SD
11. Enthusiasm (seems to enjoy teaching, is a dynamic and energetic person, has an interesting style of presentation, is enthusiastic about the subject, has a sense of humor)	SA	A	D	SD
2. The course objectives were very clear from the beginning	SA	A	D	SD
3. The instructor was one of the best	SA	A	D	SD
4. The total experience under the control of this person was very worthwhile	SA	A	D	SD
5. The class helped you to increase your knowledge, skills, and competencies more so than other classes you have taken.	SA	A	D	SD

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

H PER

⓪	⓪	⓪	⓪	⓪	⓪	⓪	⓪
①	①	①	①	①	①	①	①
②	②	②	②	②	②	②	②
③	③	③	③	③	③	③	③
④	④	④	④	④	④	④	④
⑤	⑤	⑤	⑤	⑤	⑤	⑤	⑤
⑥	⑥	⑥	⑥	⑥	⑥	⑥	⑥
⑦	⑦	⑦	⑦	⑦	⑦	⑦	⑦
⑧	⑧	⑧	⑧	⑧	⑧	⑧	⑧
⑨	⑨	⑨	⑨	⑨	⑨	⑨	⑨

Instructor

_____

Please choose the response which best represents your opinion for each statement given. For each item 1-14, darken the appropriate circle on the answer sheet.

EXAMPLES:

WRONG WRONG

WRONG RIGHT

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Use No. 2 pencil
2. Do NOT use a pen
3. Erase completely
4. Make no stray marks

THE INSTRUCTOR:		STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	
1. effectively utilized class time.	1.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2. demonstrated a well-developed plan for each class session.	2.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3. presented significant material in an understandable progression.	3.	○	○	○	○	○	○
4. provided timely feedback to the students which led to a clearer understanding of the material and improved performance.	4.	○	○	○	○	○	○
5. responded equitably to the diversity of the students.	5.	○	○	○	○	○	○
6. responded to the diverse talents and ways of learning among the members of the class.	6.	○	○	○	○	○	○
7. held students accountable for learning.	7.	○	○	○	○	○	○
8. provided meaningful learning tasks which were matched to student abilities.	8.	○	○	○	○	○	○
9. was actively involved in the student learning.	9.	○	○	○	○	○	○
10. provided assignments/tests that required application, creativity, and original thinking.	10.	○	○	○	○	○	○
11. gave examinations that were clear and significant to course material and stated objectives.	11.	○	○	○	○	○	○
12. Overall, I LEARNED A GREAT DEAL in this course.	12.	○	○	○	○	○	○
13. Overall, I rate this an excellent COURSE.	13.	○	○	○	○	○	○
14. Overall, I rate this INSTRUCTOR an excellent teacher.	14.	○	○	○	○	○	○
		○	○	○	○	○	○
		○	○	○	○	○	○
		○	○	○	○	○	○
		○	○	○	○	○	○
		○	○	○	○	○	○
		○	○	○	○	○	○

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

©, 1980, National Computer Systems, Inc. All rights reserved Printed in U.S.A.

Student Description of Teaching

Section 1 - Use these numbers to describe the instructor:

1 = Below Average
2 = Average
3 = Above Average (best 50%)
4 = Better than Most (best 30%)
5 = Superior (top 10-15%)
6 = One of the Best - Equal to any Previous Teacher
7 = The Best - Better than any Previous Teacher

Be sure to use PENCIL to mark your answer sheet.

1. SCHOLARSHIP (Has command of the subject, contrasts various points of view, discusses recent developments in the field, presents origins of ideas and concepts.)

2. ORGANIZATION/CLARITY (Explains clearly, is well prepared, presents material in an organized manner.)

3. INTERACTION WITH GROUP (Is sensitive to the reactions of the class, encourages student participation, welcomes questions and discussions.)

4. INTERACTION WITH INDIVIDUALS (Has genuine interests in students, relates to students as individuals, respects students as persons, is valued for his advice.)

5. ENTHUSIASM (Seems to enjoy teaching, is dynamic and energetic person, has an interesting style of presentation, is enthusiastic about the subject, has a sense of humor.)

6. THE INSTRUCTOR

7. THE TOTAL EXPERIENCE UNDER THE CONTROL OF THIS PERSON (Teaching, content, readings, tests, outside activities, seminars, homework...everything that you associate with this class or lab/section/seminar/group.)

8. STUDENT ACCOMPLISHMENT (The degree to which this class helped you to increase your knowledge, skills and competenciesin comparison with other classes you have taken.)

Section 2 - Use these numbers to describe the instructor:

If not relevant, leave blank

1 = Major Improvements Needed
2 = Improvement is Needed (is mediocre now)
3 = Little Improvement is Needed (well done now)
4 = No Improvement is Needed (already great)
5 = Extraordinarily Effective Now

Grading Procedures

9. FAIRNESS (so far)
10. QUALITY OF TESTS
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING OF ASSIGNMENTS
12. CLEAR EXPLANATION OF GRADING PROCEDURES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teachers Ability To

13. SPEAK CLEARLY
14. LECTURE
15. STIMULATE DISCUSSION
16. MOTIVATE STUDENTS TO LEARN
17. INDIVIDUALIZE INSTRUCTION
18. INSPIRE EXCITEMENT AND INTEREST IN COURSE CONTENT
19. ASK THOUGHT-PROVOKING QUESTIONS

Activities and Materials

20. TEXTBOOKS
21. SUPPLEMENTARY READINGS
22. MOVIES AND USE OF OTHER AV DEVICES
23. EFFECTIVE INTEGRATION OF CLASSWORK AND ASSIGNMENTS

Instructor

24. SENSE OF HUMOR
25. PREPARATIONS FOR CLASS
26. OPENNESS TO STUDENT QUESTIONS
27. RESPECT FOR STUDENTS

Organization

28. CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES
29. CLARITY OF PRESENTATION
30. STRESS ON IMPORTANT AREAS
31. SUMMARIZATION OF PTS.
32. EFFECTIVE USE OF CLASS

klg:Sec 5

Bowling Green State University

Department of Educational
Foundations & Inquiry
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403-0251
(419) 372-7322
Fax (419) 372-8265

Dear Bowling Green State University CEAP faculty in EDSE, EDCI, EDFI, HPER,

I am attempting to develop a method for identifying caring teachers or professors who can then be further studied as part of my research on **caring**. The title of my study is: Identification of Caring Professors in Teacher Education Program, College of Education and Allied Professions, BGSU. This year it is my goal to test out different methods of identification. Nominations have been made from students, faculty, and department chairs from the pool of teacher education professors at BGSU (Part 1). I am now proceeding to Part 2 of my research. I need all faculty (full, part-time, and retired) in EDFI, EDSE, EDCI, and HPER to submit their teacher evaluation scores for the courses they have taught in their most recent year of teaching. Please **do not** submit your complete scores, as protection of confidentiality. I only want the scores for specific questions targeted as potentially focusing on caring (these vary per department form, please see attached form sheet for the specific questions as per department). I do need you to identify your name with your scores. The faculty nominees' student-teacher evaluation scores for the specific, targeted questions (related to caring) will be compared and contrasted with student-teacher evaluation scores for all faculty in these four departments, concerning the same specific, targeted questions. These scores will also be compared with those who have been nominated as caring professors. I have chosen these four departments because the majority of the nominations are from these departments. Your participation in submitting your specific, targeted questions' scores on your teacher evaluations for your most recent year of teaching is strictly voluntary. Completion of the teacher evaluation form is consent of your willingness to participate. You may also withdraw your consent to the research at any time without prejudice or penalty. All partial teacher evaluation scores that are submitted are strictly confidential. They should be turned into my mailbox and will be kept locked in a desk drawer in my office, which is locked when I am not in attendance.

I thank you in advance for your assistance in helping to find ways to identify unknown teachers as **caring.** I will share with you the results of this study once it is completed.

Sincerely,

Barbara

Dr. Barbara J. Thayer-Bacon
Associate Professor, EDFI
372-2697
Rm 314 Education Building

Note: You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board, Bowling Green State University, 372-2481, if questions or problems arise during the course of this study.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Caring Teachers/Professors Study by Barbara Thayer-Bacon, Ph.D.

Teacher Evaluation Scores

For EDFI - Questions 2, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21
For EDSE - Questions 3, 4, 5, 16,17, 26, 27
For EDCI - Questions 2, 6, 10, 11
For HPER - Questions 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9

Name_____ **Department**_____

Most Recent Year of Teaching_____ **# of Courses Taught**_____

Course #_____**# of Respondents**____ **Course #**_____**# of Respondents**__

Question	Score	Question	Score

Course #_____**# of Respondents**____

Question	Score	Question	Score

Please make a copy of this form if you have taught more than four courses your most recent year of teaching, record your additional scores on the copied form, and attach to this form.

Thank you for taking the time to do this!